APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/440,442	11/15/1999	ARI V. KRISH	M-8038US	2954

33031   7590   09/29/2005

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER
BAROT, BHARAT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _14 July 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _10-30 and 33_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _10-27_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _28-30 and 33_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1.   Claims 10-30 and 33 remain for further examination.

The old rejection maintained

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-27 filed on July 14, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for the claims 10-27. The rejection is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on March 08, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4.   Claims 10-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,712) (referred to hereafter as Du).

5.   Du teaches the invention as claimed including a system and method for processing HTML documents using nested tags (see abstract).

6.   As to claim 10, Du teaches a method for processing requests from a computer network, said method comprising: connecting a computer to the computer network (figure 1); receiving a data stream from the computer network (column 3 lines 1-40, Du discloses that the server intercepts the URL data stream response); identifying a template within the data stream (column 4 lines 1-10, Du discloses that tags within the response data stream point to templates for specific applications); searching a registration table, the searching programmed to locate application database corresponding to the template (column 8 lines 1-67, Du discloses that an appropriate database is accessed to fill in the template) writing a web page resulting from the template; and sending the web page to the computer network (column 8 lines 20-43).

Du fails to explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a "department logic". Du does teach that a specific application database is accessed in response to identifying the template (see columns 8-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Du by specifying the specific application database as a department logic since the same functionality of accessing a particular web site is achieved.

7.   As to claim 11, Du teaches that determining a character set, the character set including the character set used by a requesting computer sending the data stream to the computer system (column 6 lines 60-65, Du discloses that text attributes are identified).

8.   As to claim 12, Du fails to explicitly teach the claimed limitation of opening a

socket, the receiving and the sending is through the socket, and closing the socket.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of opening

transmitting/receiving and closing a socket is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Du by specifying a socket connection. One would be motivated to do so to

create a virtual connection between processes.

9.   As to claim 13, Du teaches that creating a processing thread to process the data

stream (column 18 lines 10-15).

10.   As to claim 14, Du teaches that decoding the data stream, the decoding including

decrypting the data stream (columns 9-10 and 18-19).

11.   As to claim 15, Du teaches that decoding a uniform resource locator, the uniform

resource locator included in the data stream and identifying a server computer system

in the computer network (columns 18-19).

12.   As to claim 16, Du teaches that determining a character set, the determining

including identifying the character set used by a requesting computer in creating the

data stream (column 6 lines 60-65, Du discloses that text attributes of the browser are

identified).

13.   As to claim 17, Du teaches that processing a header contained within the data

stream, the processing including: evaluating a security token included in the header, the

security token created during a prior session by a user, to determine whether the

session is valid; and creating a new security token, the new security token used to

validate subsequent sessions by the user (columns 17-19, Du discloses that the session

state between server and client is preserved through the implementation of tags).

14.   As to claim 18, Du fails to explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a "department

logic". Du does teach that a specific CGI script associated with a application database is

accessed in response to identifying the template (columns 8-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the ad at the time of the invention

to modify Du by specifying the specific application database as a department logic since

the same functionality of accessing a particular web site is achieved.

15.   As to claim 19, Du teaches that identifying a template within the data stream

(columns 8-12).

16.   As to claim 20, claim 20 does not teach or define any new limitations above

claims 10-19 and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

17.   As to claim 21, Du teaches that parsing the template into one or more operators,

tags, and banners (columns 18-19).

18.   As to claims 22-27, claims 22-27 do not teach or define any new limitations

above claims 10-21 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Claim Objections

19.   Claims 28-30 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record fails to teach neither singly or in combination the claimed

limitation of a means for identifying the language code of a user terminal and a means

for converting one or more bytes from the data stream into a uniform language code;

and means for storing the uniform language code as in claims 28-30 and 33.

Response to Arguments

20.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-27 filed on July 14, 2005 have

been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for the claims 10-27.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

(A)   **Argument:** DuFresne neither teaches nor suggests a method including:

identifying a template within the data stream; and searching a registration table, the

searching programmed to locate application database corresponding to the template; as

required by the independent claims.

Response: DuFresne explicitly teaches a method including: identifying a template within the data stream; and searching a registration table, the searching programmed to locate application database corresponding to the template (figures 14-15; columns 3-4; and column 18 lines 6-54).

(B)   Argument: DuFresne neither teaches nor suggests that tags within response data stream point to templates for specific applications.

Response: DuFresne explicitly teaches that tags within response data stream point to templates for specific applications (figures 14-15; columns 3-4; and column 18 lines 6-54).

(C)   Argument: Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness and not shown that there is some suggestion or motivation to modify DuFresne.

Response: Examiner establishs a prima facie case of obviousness (see rejection of claim 10) and shows that there is some suggestion or motivation to modify DuFresne because DuFresne teaches that a specific application database is accessed in response to identifying the template (see columns 8-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Du by specifying the specific application database as a department logic since the same functionality of accessing a particular web site is achieved.

21.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final
action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the
event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action
and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH
shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date
the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be
calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the
statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this
final action.

Contact Information

22.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Bharat Barot** whose Telephone Number is **(571)**

272-3979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to

6:00 PM. Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is

required to be sent to the Central FAX Number **(571) 273-8300**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **Saleh Najjar**, can be reached at **(571) 272-4006**.

Patent Examiner Bharat Barot

Art Unit 2155

September 19, 2005

BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER